



Chan, C. (2019). Belonging to the City: Representations of a Colonial Clock Tower in British Hong Kong. *Journal of Urban History*, 45(2), 321-332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0096144218769894>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1177/0096144218769894](https://doi.org/10.1177/0096144218769894)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Sage at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0096144218769894> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Belonging to the City: Representations of a Colonial Clock Tower in British Hong Kong

Local identity, like Hong Kong's urban landscape, has in the last century and a half undergone various transitions. During the nineteenth century, no local identity could be spoken of as class, cultural and occupational classifications divided the Chinese population.ⁱ Many of the Chinese traveled to Hong Kong only to find temporary solace, though many ended up toiling in hardship to make a living. The European settlers, on the other hand, invested in recreating a European life through familiar sights: English clubs were set up and in 1862, Hong Kong's first clock tower became a part of a foreign-dominated area.ⁱⁱ When the clock tower faced demolition in the late nineteenth century, only European voices were heard of, mostly in arguing for its destruction. A striking contrast is evident if we compare this with calls for the preservation of the clock tower almost a century later in the 1970s: by this time, Chinese district locals and European and Eurasian elites stepped out to protect the clock tower. Through the lens of a clock tower, this study looks at the identity representations behind heritage preservation in British Hong Kong at a time when an official body and heritage legislation were still at the outset.ⁱⁱⁱ These were voices from the grassroots and they say something about social transformation, as well as collective identity.

The clock tower, hereafter termed as Pedder Street clock tower (1862-1915) and Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower (1919-present), was first built in Central during the 1860s and later rebuilt in Tsim Sha Tsui in the early twentieth century. As this study will argue, the landmark shifted from a structure of European symbolism to one that represented a local district of Chinese and foreigners. From a larger context, the case of the Pedder Street clock tower reflected the existence of rigid racial stratification in nineteenth century Hong Kong. The changes that could be observed with the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower, in turn, showed the formation of a more unified Hong Kong society by the second half of the twentieth century. I will trace the development of this shift geographically and culturally, linking these with the social transformations behind through a careful study of

newspaper reports, historical narratives, travel writing, letters and photographs related to the clock tower between the 1860s and 1970s.

From its construction to its demolition, the different biographies of the Hong Kong clock tower, together with the voices that called for its preservation will reveal the relationship between colonialism, heritage preservation and collective identity. A rich body of literature around Hong Kong has already highlighted the rise of local identity and the use of heritage sites as resistance against the People's Republic of China, particularly in the twenty-first century.^{iv} Local awareness, however, did not emerge overnight. This study looks at the earlier developments in Hong Kong's local identity and argues that first, although Chinese people began to join heritage preservation movements in the 1970s, their sense of belonging to the city was restricted to district identities. Second, this rise in local awareness towards urban heritage was largely influenced and shaped by European and Eurasian elites in the context of British Hong Kong's urban culture. By studying Hong Kong's heritage preservation in the colonial era, this study suggests that the lives of urban landmarks during colonisation are not less important in understanding the construction of local identities than in the post-colonial context.

1862-1915: The Clock Tower in European Social Life

Several studies have acknowledged the role of European clock towers in the Asian urban space. Yeh Wen-hsin, for instance, observed the clock tower in the Bund, Shanghai as a representation of socioeconomic transformations. According to Yeh, the increasing importance of the mechanical clock in Shanghai signified a new awareness of time conception that was related to the city's evolution into a leading treaty port.^v Jeffrey Wasserstrom also studied the Shanghai clock tower and associated the landmark's shift in symbolism to the rise of an urbanised Pudong.^{vi} Of clock towers in colonial spaces, Giordano Nanni argued that colonisers used clock towers as tools to justify imperialism. Timepieces in colonial Australia and South Africa signified the 'ideological conversion' of indigenous communities from backwardness to efficiency.^{vii} However, this did not mean that such a 'conversion' was completely embraced by colonised

subjects. In Indian cities, time conception became a negotiating space for political conflict between rulers and the ruled.^{viii} Other works perceived clock towers as a symbolic structure of modernity and modern lifestyle.^{ix} Although the literature I highlighted have examined clock towers in different contexts, timeframes and spaces, they all noted the linkage between European clock towers and their function of spreading western cultural influence in Asia. Clock towers, in this sense, are more than functional timepieces; they carry various purposes that change according to location and across different stages in time. It is in this vein that this study looks at the case of the Hong Kong clock tower as a timepiece that echoed colonialism, cosmopolitanism and later, localism.

The first clock tower in Hong Kong was constructed at Pedder Street, Queen's Road through public subscription in the early 1860s and later funded by a Scottish watchmaker, Douglas Lapraik, in the nineteenth century capital of Hong Kong, the Central district.^x During this period, Queen's Road was a typical illustration of Hong Kong's colonial hierarchy (Figure 1): rickshaws and Chinese coolies dominated the entrance and the further one proceeded into the area, the closer they would get to foreign business buildings, the Hongkong bank and the Hong Kong hotel, which were built respectively in 1865 and 1866.^{xi} Foreign settlers in the nineteenth century commended the Central district as a successful attempt of transforming a once worn-out, muddy and littered district into a well-lit and well-paved modern world.^{xii} The clock tower, standing in the middle of the growing commercial area, slowly but surely became a part of the European community's center of social life. One description written about 1870s British Hong Kong noted the presence of the clock tower within a world of European architecture and life: '...the Mint Dam and the Blue Pool and the Clock Tower chiming the hour for all the world like Old Penang... the City Hall, the new chancel at St. John's, the Botanical Gardens, the racquet-courts at Headquarter House, Kennedy's Stables at Causeway Bay and the Victoria Recreation Club (offering young gentlemen from England facilities for gymnastics, swimming and boating) so generously ministered.'^{xiii}

Considering that the general majority of the Chinese to be seen in Central during this time were rickshaw drivers and coolies, the clock tower functioned for the most part in the nineteenth century for the foreign community. The clock tower was connected to a drinking fountain and served not only as a town clock, but also a fire bell. It would strike once to signal fire in the eastern district, twice for the central district and three times when there was fire in the western district. During this stage, some Europeans also relied on the electric clock to set their watches periodically to standard time. Despite its many practical functions, not many in the European community admired the Pedder Street landmark: it was quite prone to malfunction and by the late 1800s, had become an obstruction to traffic in the prospering district. After the introduction of motorcars, Queen's Road was a chaotic scene and the clock tower seemed to be getting in the way of normal day-to-day operations. Nineteenth century historian and renowned government official Ernst Johann Eitel unapologetically referred to the landmark as 'an ugly tower obstructing the principal thoroughfare.'^{xiv} Travelers called the landmark a broken clock and a poem about the clock tower appeared in the *South China Morning Post* (SCMP) with the title 'Bunging up the road!'^{xv} In 1909, a resident wrote to the local English press a complaint regarding the Pedder Street clock tower, quoting 'The largest town clock in the world is in the tower of Glasgow University... the ugliest and most useless town clock in the world is in Pedder's St., Hong Kong.'^{xvi}

Situated in a largely European-dominated area of British Hong Kong, the first-generation clock tower was no doubt a symbol of European presence in the Asian colony. Chinese voices were clearly absent from public discussions regarding the fate of the clock tower. It was perhaps due to their lack of interest, particularly considering that a great portion of the Chinese in the district were coolie workers, or it could have been because the Chinese and the Europeans simply belonged to two different worlds in nineteenth century Hong Kong. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, racial legislations and residential segregation were in force to segregate the two communities.^{xvii} European commoners despised of the Chinese subjects to a degree that the mere sight of coolies convening below the clock tower upset many foreign settlers.

Two letters made their way to the editor of the SCMP in 1910, urging the government to drive the coolies away from the area. A letter signed 'One of the Sufferers' defined the sight as a 'public nuisance': 'Pedder Street below the clock tower is filled with a mob of filthy coolies, the scum of Hongkong, who expectorate over every thing, invade private areas, sit on the door steps of stores and makes business extremely unpleasant.'^{xviii} Another reader complained about the 'coolie nuisance in the vicinity of the clock tower' and presumed it rational to remove the coolies from the Central district as they wrote: 'Surely the streets are not supposed to be the happy camping grounds of all the scallywags in the Colony?'^{xix}

In face of rapid urban development and land shortage in Hong Kong, European merchants and politicians within the Legislative Council brought the problematic clock tower to the government's attention. At a meeting on 28 February 1898, the Colonial Treasurer suggested the relocation of the post office from Queen's Road and removal of the Clock Tower for wider road accessibility on the south and a finer frontage to the east.^{xx} After successive debate that was brought forth to the next decade, the clock tower was eventually knocked down in 1913 and sold at a public auction for 662.50 Hong Kong dollars. The demolition of the Pedder Street clock tower, notably, did not take place without a part of the foreign community showing their sympathy and regret. A few years before the clock tower was taken down, a reader of a local newspaper questioned 'What would Hongkong do without its clock tower?' and suggested that the 'venerable landmark' deserved better maintenance as a public building.^{xxi} Other accounts described the clock tower as a 'beloved friend' and a 'memory' of the foreign communities in Hong Kong.^{xxii}

The Pedder Street clock tower, loved and hated by foreign settlers, a place of footing for Chinese coolies indifferent towards its existence, allows us much to reflect on today. In considering Hong Kong's early colonial experience, the clock tower, thanks to its location, served more than the purpose of a European timepiece. The exclusivity of public discussion to the Europeans showed the social separation between the Chinese and European communities and like the Central district, the clock tower emerged as a space for the foreign settlers to

extend their imagination of the Chinese natives as different, backward and uneducated. The Pedder Street clock tower belonged not only to Central and the foreign settlers, but it made it obvious the worlds of the Chinese and the Europeans in Hong Kong existed in two varying poles.

1919-Present: The Clock Tower of 'Hong Kong'

Prior to the demolition of the Pedder Street clock tower, a series of debates took place in the Legislative Council regarding the erection of a new replacement. In 1905, an official proposed to have the Governor 'take the Clock Tower by the hand and lead it down towards the water front, and endow it with a large clean new face.'^{xxiii} This was exactly what happened and the second-generation clock tower, which I will hereafter call the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower, was rebuilt in a new location during a brand new era. Standing next to the Victoria Harbour, the new timepiece was built by the British government and designed by government architect of the Federated Malay States, A.B. Hubback.^{xxiv} Tsim Sha Tsui had been an important area of colonial planning since the cession of the Kowloon Peninsula during the Second Opium War.^{xxv} By the early twentieth century, Tsim Sha Tsui had already become one of British Hong Kong's transport hubs and commercial centers. Travelers from London and elsewhere in the world made their way to Tsim Sha Tsui where places of accommodation like the famous Peninsula Hotel, or the YMCA and other hotels and boarding houses emerged one after the other. In 1913, the Kowloon-Canton Railway (KCR) terminus was built in the district and it was next to the terminus that the clock tower would receive new meaning.

Due to its location by the harbour, the KCR terminus, together with the clock tower quickly became known as an important symbol of British colonialism (Figure 2). Often called the Far East train terminus of the British Empire, it was an iconic sight for bewildered Chinese immigrants and a stopover for weary travelers from London via the Trans-Siberian Express. The clock tower, by this time rebuilt in red brick and granite at forty-four-meters tall, retained one of its old faces and was installed with a new mechanic clock.^{xxvi} The clock chimed

every quarter of an hour, reminding travelers waiting to board trains of the standard time. As a part of a busy terminus, the Tsim Sha Tsui timepiece would be remembered by the millions of Chinese immigrants anxious for their new life in Hong Kong as a marker of their arrival to the British colony. In the 1940s when China experienced a series of unrest from civil war, refugees flocked to Hong Kong and crowded the train terminus. In contrast with the Pedder Street clock tower, the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower saw a shift in its overall career and representation along with the city's evolution. This will be again explained by the changing perceptions of various communities towards the landmark.

For the British administration, the KCR terminus and clock tower was an important representation of its colonial management. It was symbolic of Hong Kong's transformation into a cosmopolitan and progressive city and was seen as the western world's 'big door to China.'^{xxvii} However when in the 1970s the KCR terminus was relocated to newly reclaimed land in Hung Hom, the government decided to tear down both the terminus and the clock tower. A cultural complex would replace the structure, particularly as a part of the government's initiatives in strengthening local culture and identity. In early 1977, European, Eurasian and Chinese elites stepped out to protect the KCR terminus and clock tower. The Hong Kong Heritage Society was formed by prominent European elites like British architect David Russell and radio journalist Patricia Penn. A number of fourth-generation Hong Kong locals of Portuguese, Eurasian and Chinese descent also joined the committee.^{xxviii} Shortly after its establishment, the Hong Kong Heritage Society sent a petition to the Governor of Hong Kong, a portion of which read:

The cultural value of the Kowloon-Canton Railway Station is found in its link with the past. The clock tells the time, of time past to remind us of the role of the station as a gateway to China at the beginning of the longest railway journey to Peking; of time present to remind us that the everyday life of today has perspective from history and better meaning when we develop a sense of identity with the place in which we live in.^{xxix}

In an attempt to emphasize the importance of heritage, the Society compared the clock tower's importance to 'Egypt's pyramids, Peking's Forbidden City, London's Big Ben and St. Peter's in Rome.'^{xxx} In 1977, the Hong Kong Heritage Society collected 14,360 signatures, 7,936 of which were collected outside of the terminus within five days. According to accounts from the Society, a huge portion of those who signed up were Chinese and came from all walks of life; there were shop workers, factory workers and clerks.^{xxxi} Voices from the Chinese community were heard, particularly through the platform of neighbourhood associations. The Heritage Society received the help of the Tsim Sha Tsui *Kaifong* (neighbourhood) Association, a district organisation that served the Chinese local residents, in persuading the Chinese to sign the petition. The fight for the landmark also made headlines in Chinese newspapers. In 1975, a local writer penned an article about the clock tower in local Chinese newspaper *Hong Kong Economic Journal* 信報. This article, however, was a critique towards the general indifference of Chinese locals towards heritage preservation. The writer questioned why few from the Chinese community had made an effort to fight for heritage preservation. Using examples from Rome and London, the writer further suggested that the landmark could be turned into a museum instead.^{xxxii}

During this time, voices from both the European and the Chinese communities were heard, particularly from those that resided in or were familiar with the Tsim Sha Tsui district. The efforts of the foreign settlers and the Hong Kong Heritage Society played an important role in the spread of awareness regarding heritage preservation. As early as in 1966, the Kowloon Residents' Association, formed by Europeans back in 1921, had already proposed to the Colonial Secretary a plan for the land surrounding the KCR terminus. In their proposal, the Association emphasised the terminus and clock tower as distinguished symbols of Kowloon (Figure 3).^{xxxiii} Two important points may be made of the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower: first, the landmark was no longer exclusive of non-Europeans, reflecting twentieth century social changes in Hong Kong, especially of the elimination of racial legislations.^{xxxiv} Second, although Chinese voices were heard in the 1970s, it should be maintained that the majority of the Chinese population remained indifferent to heritage preservation. Some studies have

pointed to the 1967 riots as a cradle for Hong Kong localism.^{xxxv} These works have argued that the riots propelled the majority of Hong Kong locals to become united in supporting the British administration against Communist influence in the colony.^{xxxvi} The case of the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower, however, shows that despite the fact that the Chinese communities were beginning to participate in social movements, people continued to be apathetic during the late 1970s, if at least towards the future of colonial heritage and urban landmarks.

The limited participation and lack of fervour from the Chinese population frustrated David Russell and eventually led to his decision to dissolve the Hong Kong Heritage Society in 1983. In an interview, Russell commented that Hong Kong lacked depth and culture, its people indifferent towards heritage preservation, quoting 'Hong Kong is not a cultured society. It is a plastic society.'^{xxxvii} In a 1977 report from the Urban Council, it was documented that the public protest for the KCR station's preservation was stimulated by public emotion that was 'confined to expatriates,' and excluding the majority of Hong Kong local Chinese.^{xxxviii} Dr. Denny Huang, an elected Chinese member of the Urban Council between 1967 and 1986 argued against the preservation of the clock tower. According to Huang, the landmark was merely a representation of the colonial era; another Chinese member, named as Miss Yeung, agreed that the clock tower had to be demolished for aesthetic purposes.^{xxxix} Nonetheless, the case of the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower poses as a striking contrast to that of the Pedder Street clock tower: racial segregation was no longer as rigid as was in the nineteenth century and a portion of the Chinese population was beginning to demonstrate a sense of district identity. These transformations were orchestrated by new government policies, historical turns, as well as the leadership of European and Eurasian elites. Unlike the Pedder Street clock tower, the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower belonged not only to Tsim Sha Tsui and the foreign settlers, but it symbolised a shared world between the Chinese and the Europeans in colonial Hong Kong.

Conclusion: Identity In Progress

The 1977 struggle for the preservation of the KCR terminus did not succeed. The station was torn down, leaving the clock tower standing on its own. At a time when the city no longer relied on the large faces of the timepiece to check the hours, the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower, by this point also renamed the 'former KCR station clock tower' quietly faded into the new cultural complex. In 1990, the clock tower became a declared monument under the Antiquities and Monuments Office, described by official documents as a historical landmark and 'the only standing testimony to the demolished original terminus of the Kowloon-Canton Railway which was the 'gateway to China' for more than sixty years.'^{xl} The colonial landmark would only be remembered by travel guides in a similar manner as '...an isolated symbol of Hong Kong's rapidly fading colonial past' but ignored by the thousands of tourists and locals that flocked to nearby shopping malls and stayed by the harbour only to watch the silly lights show.^{xli} Also in a pessimistic tone, the late Ackbar Abbas described the Tsim Sha Tsui clock tower as 'not more than decorative' and reflective of Hong Kong's 'floating' identity, made up of piecemeal cultural representations.^{xlii}

Without a practical function and stripped of nothing more than a historical 'memorabilia,' I thought the clock tower had finally reached the end of its life by the twenty-first century. In 2014, I was to see a photograph of the clock tower again in the local newspaper. Conflict had broken out below the clock tower between pro-Beijing supporters (Defend Hong Kong Campaign and the Voice of Loving Hong Kong) and anti-Beijing, 'anti-locust' members.^{xliii} When the Umbrella Movement took place, pro-police groups rallied in front of the clock tower against public accusations of the Hong Kong police force as pro-Beijing.^{xliv} In 2015, the clock tower made it to the local newspapers again. A group of about 100 protesters from a local group called Defend Hong Kong dressed in yellow and black and held yellow umbrellas in front of the clock tower, pledging to defend the city's core values like legal and academic freedom in commemoration of the 2014 Umbrella Movement and ironically, on China's National Day (Figure 4).^{xlv}

With the rise of anti-China sentiments in Hong Kong, the clock tower re-emerged as a space of resistance against the PRC. In face of encroachment from the PRC,

the city's colonial past and colonial landmarks have received new purpose and meaning in fending off China's influence. Rethinking the different biographies of the clock tower, we can be certain that urban spaces grow and transform along with time. Landmarks take on the trends of the times, switching functions and representations along with social transformations. In a century and a half, the clock tower has developed from a European timepiece to a milestone in the construction of district identity to an anti-PRC symbol that prides on Hong Kong's unique colonial past. For this fluidity, every stage of the clock tower's life has not failed in narrating a Hong Kong tale of its own.

Figure 1



This old postcard, seemingly of Queen's Road in the early 1900s shows the busy surroundings of the Pedder Street Clock Tower. It stood in an area dominated by foreign business firms and Chinese coolies, a chaotic sight when we think of the racial segregation during this period.^{xlvi}

Figure 2



The photograph is of a newly built KCR terminus, which would become a proud achievement of the British colony in the early twentieth century. The KCR, also called the Far East train terminus of the British Empire, was an icon of the British colony's dominant position in Asia. Looking closely at the clock tower, we can catch a glimpse of an incomplete structure: the clocks were still without faces. Until 1919, the clock tower had only one face as the other three faces could not be shipped due to interruptions from the First World War. Installation was completed in 1921.^{xlvi}

Figure 3



THE HON. MR. J. P. BRAGA, senior Legislative Council member for Kowloon, has the Peninsula in his grasp.

Drawn by Portuguese cartoonist J. Álvares in 1929, the caricature shows J.P. Braga, a renowned Portuguese leader in Hong Kong and the Tsim Sha Tsui district, leaning unto the KCR station and the clock tower. Tsim Sha Tsui was by then emerging as a unique district with its own symbolic icons. This district identity would be reflected in the 1970s as district residents and urban elites stepped out to fight for the station's preservation.^{xlvi}

Figure 4



This is a 2016 photograph of the clock tower. The colonial timepiece has regained significance as a space of resistance against the People's Republic of China since 2014. Here young participants raise their yellow umbrellas, a symbol of the Umbrella Movement in protesting against the PRC on National Day.^{xlix}

ⁱ Chinese elites, for instance, belonged to their own class as explained in Elizabeth Sinn, *Power and Charity: A Chinese Merchant Elite in Colonial Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003);

ⁱⁱ For more on the foreign settlers in early Hong Kong, see Christopher Munn, *Anglo-China: Chinese People and British Rule in Hong Kong, 1841-1880* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009), 57-59.

ⁱⁱⁱ It was only in 1977 that the Antiquities and Monuments Office and Antiquities Advisory Board were set up by the British government under legislation to protect local heritage.

^{iv} A number of works have focused on the preservation movement for the Star Ferry Pier in 2006. For examples, see Yun-chung Chen and Mirana M. Szeto, 'The Forgotten Road of Progressive Localism: New Preservation Movement in Hong Kong,' *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 16, no. 3 (2015), 436-453; Jinghui Chen 陳景輝, *Caomu jiebing: maixiang quanmian zhengzhi hua shehui* 草木皆兵: 邁向全面政治化社會 (Imaginary Enemies: Towards A Full-Scale Politicised Society; Xianggang: Hong quban (yuanzuo wenhua), 2013), 92-100; Mee-kam Ng, Wing-shing Tang, and Joanne Lee, 'Spatial Practice, Conceived Space and Lived Space: Hong Kong's 'Piers Saga' Through the Lefebvrian Lens,' *Planning Perspectives* 25, no. 4 (2010), 411-431.

^v Wen-hsin Yeh, 'Corporate Space, Communal Time: Everyday Life in Shanghai's Bank of China,' *The American Historical Review* 100, 1 (February 1995), 97-122.

-
- ^{vi} Jeffrey N. Wassertrom, 'A Big Ben with Chinese Characteristics: the Customs House as Urban Icon in Old and New Shanghai,' *Urban History* 33, 1 (May 2006), 65-84.
- ^{vii} Giordano Nanni, *The Colonization of Time: Ritual, Routine and Resistance in the British Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).
- ^{viii} Vanessa Ogle, 'Whose Time Is It? The Pluralization of Time and the Global Connection, 1870s-1940s,' *American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (2013):1376-1402.
- ^{ix} Avner Wishnitzer, *Reading Clocks, Alla Turca: Time and Society in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).
- ^x Douglas Lapraik was a successful businessman who founded his own watchmaking business in 1846 and later co-founded the Hong Kong & Whampoa Dock Company. He was also a generous and prominent Hong Kong citizen, having built the Douglas Castle, a university. For more on Lapraik, see Peter Hansell, 'The Colourful Douglas Lapraik (1818-1869),' *Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 42 (2002), 381-384;
- ^{xi} A contemporary description of Queen's Road in the nineteenth century is as follows: 'There was a close correlation between depth and seniority: the further one proceeded from the main entrance at Queen's Road, the nearer one approached the core of power.' For this, see Shirley Wong, 'Colonialism, Power and the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank,' in Iain Borden, et al. (eds.), *The Unknown City: Contesting Architecture and Social Space* (Boston, Mass.: MIT Press, 2002), 64. Also see, *Picturesque Hong Kong: A Handbook for Travelers* (Hong Kong, 1911), 65.
- ^{xii} This description of 1860s' Pedder Street by historian Jan Morris was seen in Eric Cavaliero's article for *The Standard* (13 Aug. 1998) entitled 'Pedder Street was Where It all Happened' found online in http://www.thestandard.com.hk/news_detail.asp?art_id=40111&con_type=1&ear_year=1998 (visited 3 Feb. 2015).
- ^{xiii} Geoffrey Robley Sayer, *Hong Kong 1862-1919: Years of Discretion* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1975), 32.
- ^{xiv} Eitel's remarks can be found in Cavaliero, 'Pedder Street was where It all Happened.'
- ^{xv} "'Bunging up the Road!' A Recent Discovery,' *South China Morning Post* (11 Oct. 1905), 2.
- ^{xvi} 'The Clock Tower,' *South China Morning Post* (22 Jul. 1909), 7.
- ^{xvii} Racial legislations directed at segregating the Chinese were made from the 1850s onwards. For instance, the Light and Pass Ordinance of 1857 was a curfew that restricted the freedom of the Chinese to go out at night. If a Chinese was seen after eight, and later nine, he/she was required to carry a lantern and a letter of permission from his/her employer. In 1888 and 1904, the Peak Reservation Ordinance was set up to prevent the Chinese from residing at the Peak, reserving the area exclusively for European residency.
- ^{xviii} 'Correspondence: A Public Nuisance,' *South China Morning Post* (15 Jun. 1910), 2.
- ^{xix} 'A Just Complaint: The Coolie Nuisance At The Clock Tower,' *South China Morning Post* (7 Jun. 1910), 11.

-
- xx Hong Kong Legislative Council, Official Record of Proceedings (28 Feb. 1898), 38; accessed from <http://www.legco.gov.hk/1897-98/h980228.pdf> on 2 Feb. 2015.
- xxi 'The Clock Tower,' *South China Morning Post* (15 Sept. 1910), 2.
- xxii 'A Dear Friend,' *South China Morning Post* (24 February 1911), 6.
- xxiii Hong Kong Legislative Council Official Record of Proceedings (21 Sept. 1905), 31; accessed from <http://www.legco.gov.hk/1905/h050921.pdf> on 5 Feb. 2015. There were other suggestions as to the location of the new clock tower on Blake Pier and also the new Post Office. For the report on Blake Pier, see 'Blake Pier and the Clock Tower,' *The Hong Kong Weekly Press and China Overland Trade Report* (Daily Press, 22 Sept. 1902), 215. For the proposal on the Post Office, see 'The Clock Tower,' *The Hong Kong Weekly Press and China Overland Trade Report*, 27 Jun. 1904, 468. Hong Kong Legislative Council Official Record of Proceedings (13 Oct. 1905), 39; accessed from <http://www.legco.gov.hk/1905/h051013.pdf> on 5 Feb. 2015.
- xxiv Hubback is well known for designing the famous Kuala Lumpur railway station.
- xxv Shortly after British occupation, Tsim Sha Tsui (initially Tseen Sha-Tow) underwent a series of reclamation and urban development. Native villagers were successively forced out and a ban was made to prevent natives and Chinese locals from returning to and entering the area. For this, see Wai Kwok Cheung 張偉國, 'Zhong ying yapien zhanzheng de yinfadian—jian shazui cun kaoshi 中英鴉片戰爭的引發點 尖沙咀村考實' (The Origin of the Opium War: A Study of the Tseen Sha-tow Village in Kai Yin Lam 林啓彥 and Cindy Yik Yi Chu 朱益宜 (eds.), *Ya Pian Zhanzheng de Zai Renshi* 鴉片戰爭的再認識 (Recomprehending the Opium War; Hong Kong, 2003), 99-113.
- xxvi Wu Hao 吳昊, *Huaijiu Xianggang Di* 懷舊香港地 (Nostalgic Hong Kong; Hong Kong, 2002), 83.
- xxvii The term 'a big door to China' (*zhongguo damen* 中國大門) was used by Urban Council member Elsie Tu 杜葉錫恩 in 1990 to describe the clock tower, then already a remnant of the KCR terminus. 'Jianshazui zhonglou liangdeng, xiangjiang yejing tian huacai 尖沙咀鐘樓亮燈, 香江夜景添華采' (The Tsim Sha Tsui Clock Tower Lights Up, Adding Vivacity to the Night View of the Fragrant Harbour), *Overseas Chinese Daily News* 華僑日報 (25 June 1990), 5.
- xxviii For a list of members, see Meacham, William Meacham, David Russell and Elizabeth Sinn, *The Struggle for Hong Kong's Heritage: Narrative, Documents and Reminiscences of the Early Years* (Hong Kong: Meacham William, 2015), 80-81.
- xxix The Heritage Society's proposal can be found in a reprint from *South China Morning Post* entitled 'Strong Public Support to Keep KCR Buildings' (3 Aug. 1977), 6. For a detailed account of the Hong Kong Heritage Society's struggle for the clock tower, see Meacham, *The Struggle for Hong Kong's Heritage*.
- xxx Gary Coull, 'Save Railway Station Plea to Queen,' *South China Morning Post* (9 Feb. 1978), 1.
- xxxi Meacham, *The Struggle for Hong Kong's Heritage*, 84, 92.
- xxxii Jianlu Liu 劉魯建, 'Baoliu jiu Jianshazui huoche zhan 保留舊尖沙咀火車' (Preserve the Old Tsim Sha Tsui Train Station), *Hong Kong Economic Journal* 信報財經新聞 (27 Oct. 1975), 3.

xxxiii Jianshazui huochezhan yao shefa baocun: da zhonglou xiangzheng jiulong naiyi yixiu jianzhu qiewei lishixing jilu chezhan ji weifeilu bingfang yishe youshua difang 尖沙咀火車站要設法保存：大鐘樓象徵九龍 乃一優秀建築物且為歷史性紀錄 車站及威菲路兵房宜設遊要地方' (The Tsim Sha Tsui Terminus Ought to be Conserved: The Clock Tower Symbolizes Kowloon as the Only Historical Architecture; the Station and the Whitfield Barracks Should Be Made a Recreational Area), *Overseas Chinese Daily News* 華僑日報 (15 March 1966), Section 2, 1.

xxxiv The Peak Reservation Ordinance, for instance, ended in 1930

xxxv These studies have argued that the leftist-supported 1967 riots not only shifted local support towards the British government but resulted in the administration's efforts to make Hong Kong a better place to live in. A series of welfare was introduced, including a nine-year compulsory education, law amendments to shorten working hours to forty-eight by 1971, an anti-corruption establishment in the ICAC (Independent Commission Against Corruption) and a large-scale public housing project that Chief Secretary of Hong Kong Jack Cater (term in office: 1978-1981). For this, see Gary Ka-wai Cheung, *Hong Kong's Watershed: The 1967 Riots* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009), 5.

xxxvi One narration is as observed by Nelson Chow Wing-sun: '...at the time of the 1967 riots, I felt Hong Kong people were generally lukewarm towards the government but they were disgusted with the acts of the leftists. Hong Kong people realized that they had to unite together in support for the government. From then on, Hong Kong people appeared to start treasuring this place. At least Hong Kong was their haven where they were sheltered from the disasters arising from the Cultural Revolution' in Erwin Atwood, *Goodbye Gweilo: Public Opinion and the 1997 Problem in Hong Kong* (New Jersey, 1996), 5-6.

xxxvii For this, see Barbara Basler, 'Hong Kong: A City Bent on Erasing its Past,' *New York Times* (31 March 1988), found online in <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/03/31/world/hong-kong-a-city-bent-on-erasing-its-past.html> (visited 11 August 2015).

xxxviii Urban Council, 'Proposed Preservation of Part of Former KCR Station at Tsim Sha Tsui' (29 April 1977), stored as UC.CW.19.77, 2.

xxxix Urban Council, 'Minutes of the Meeting of Standing Committee of the Whole Council Select Committee of Urban Council' (16 November 1976), stored as UC.CW161176, 2.

xl Urban Council, 'Declaration of the Tsim Sha Tsui Clock Tower as a Historical Building under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance' (23 February 1990), stored as USD HKCC 21/19.

xli Graham Bond, *Frommer's Hong Kong Day by Day* (New Jersey, 2011), 46.

xliv Ackbar Abbas, 'Building on Disappearance: Hong Kong Architecture and Colonial Space,' in Simon During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York, 1999), 155-156; 'Hyphenation: The Spatial Dimensions of HK Culture,' in Michael Steinberg (ed.), *Walter Benjamin and the Demands of History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 219.

xlvi The 'anti-locust' movement was a 'localist' movement against the flooding of mainland tourists in Hong Kong. These mainland tourists were termed as 'locusts.' For the report, see Kelly Ip, 'Face-off Turns Ugly: Police Moved in to Prevent a Free-for-All in Tsim Sha Tsui Yesterday Afternoon between a Group

Demanding Limits on Tourists from Across the Border and People Standing Up for the Mainlanders,' *The Standard* (17 February 2014), online source from http://www.thestandard.com.hk/news_print.asp?art_id=142592&sid=41595630 (viewed 12 January 2016).

^{xliv} The Umbrella Movement is a pro-democracy movement without clear leadership against the Hong Kong Police and the PRC. Also known as Occupy Central, the occupy campaign witnessed the use of tear gas and violence between protesters and local police, creating a huge impact that paralyzed some transport lanes and sent students in a class boycott campaign. For the report, see 'Umbrella Movement through the End of October,' *Fullbright* (14 November 2014), online source from <https://vsmyanhk.wordpress.com/2014/11/14/umbrella-movement-through-the-end-of-october/> (viewed 12 January 2016).

^{xlvi} Gloria Chan, 'Black Day: Hongkongers Gather on National Day to Protest against Mainland China's Hand in City,' *South China Morning Post* (1 October 2015), online source from <http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/1863168/back-black-hongkongers-gather-national-day-protest-mainland> (viewed 12 January 2016).

^{xlvi} Valery M. Garrett, *Hong Kong: Life and Times* (Singapore, 1996), 120.

^{xlvii} Photo courtesy of Cheng Po-hung and viewed in 'Former Kowloon-Canton Railway Terminal' (3 Jan. 2014), *The Hong Kong Heritage Blog Project*, <https://honghongheritage.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/kcr-no-clock-face.jpg> on 14 Feb. 2015.

^{xlviii} Cartoon by J. Álvares published in *China Mail* (22 January 1929). Source from Stuart Braga, 'Making Impressions: The Adaptation of a Portuguese Family to Hong Kong, 1700-1950,' Ph.D. dissertation, The Australian National University, 2012, 278.

^{xlix} 羅君豪 Luo Junhao, 'Xuesheng kuaishan chengshan gaoge wei gequ zhanling zhe daqi 學生快閃撐傘高 歌為各區佔領者打氣' (Students Hold Umbrellas High While Singing In Support of Protesters in Different Districts), *Apple Daily 蘋果日報* (3 November 2014), online <http://hk.apple.nextmedia.com/news/art/20141103/18921881> (viewed 13 January 2016).